

Draft
BAY-DELTA ADVISORY COUNCIL
MEETING SUMMARY
February 17, 2000
Sacramento Association of Realtor's Auditorium

BDAC Members and Members of the Public in Attendance: See attached sign-in sheets

Major Outcomes

- **Preferred Program Alternative** - BDAC assessed the strengths and weaknesses of the Preferred Program Alternative. Vice Chair Sunne McPeak moved, BDAC member Eric Hasseltine seconded, and BDAC member Alex Hildebrand amended a motion to endorse the preferred alternative, as written, with a recommendation for aggressive progress on several key issues. BDAC will review, discuss and possibly endorse a revised motion at its April 13, 2000 meeting.
- **Ecosystem Restoration FY 2001 Implementation Plan Recommendation** - BDAC concurred with the draft Implementation Plan.

1. Welcome and Chair's Report (Chair Mike Madigan)

Chair Mike Madigan opened the meeting at 9:45 am and stated that the next BDAC meeting was rescheduled to Thursday, April 13, 2000 in Sacramento. Later in the meeting, the following BDAC members expressed interest in attending the February 23, 2000 Policy Group meeting: Alex Hildebrand, Byron Buck, Bob Raab, Martha Guzman, Torri Estrada, Mike Madigan, and Sunne McPeak.

2. Executive Director's Report (Acting Executive Director Steve Ritchie)

Acting CALFED Executive Director Steve Ritchie announced that a joint legislative hearing on CALFED governance and finance was scheduled for 9:00 am February 29, 2000.

Staff Commitment:

Mr. Ritchie will report on the results of the state/federal discussions by Secretary of Interior Bruce Babbitt and representatives from Governor Davis' office at the April 13 BDAC meeting.

3. CALFED Preferred Program Alternative Assessment (Steve Ritchie)

Presentation:

Mr. Ritchie reviewed the content of the Preferred Program Alternative, distinguished between the programmatic nature of the alternative and details included in the implementation plan, and reviewed the agreements and regulatory actions needed to approve the Alternative and the Environmental Impact Statement/Report.

Discussion:

BDAC members assessed the Preferred Program Alternative by providing a few comments on the Preferred Alternative and the EIS/EIR assessment. Many other comments focused on implementation, such as refinements to individual program plans and governance and finance issues. An underlying issue, as stated by Mike Madigan, is deciding where population growth in California should be focused — in existing population centers, such as the coast, or in the Central Valley. See February 23, 2000 memo from Chair Madigan and Vice Chair McPeak to the CALFED Policy Group for a detailed list of comments (in Preferred Program Alternative Implementation section of meeting packet).

Vice Chair McPeak, Mr. Hasseltine and Mr. Hildebrand asserted that many of BDAC concerns could be dealt with during implementation (Phase III of the CALFED Program). They summed up the assessment with the following proposed amended motion, with the understanding that more discussion was needed before a recommendation could be forwarded to the CALFED Policy Group.

Proposed motion:

To endorse the preferred alternative as written and recommend aggressive progress on:

- identifying guaranteed funding for ecosystem restoration,
- guaranteeing Delta outflows that support fish populations,
- optimizing water use efficiency and links to other program elements, such as storage,
- decisions regarding storage and conveyance facilities during Stage 1,

Amendments:

- optimizing through Delta conveyance,
- accurately identifying water supply increases from actions,
- Balancing competing needs within and outside the Delta,

Mr. Hildebrand suggested that the Record of Decision/Certification contain a preamble that commits to resolving the issues contained in the bullets.

Staff Commitment:

Staff agreed to work with Chair Madigan and Vice Chair McPeak to revise the proposed motion.

BDAC Next Steps:

The Chair and Vice Chair will present a revised motion to BDAC for discussion and possible endorsement at the April 13, 2000 BDAC meeting.

4. Public Comment

Greg Zlotnick (Santa Clara Valley Water District) urged that aggressive planning and design of the isolated conveyance was needed during Stage 1, in the event that dual conveyance is found to be a necessary tool for improving water quality and conditions for fish.

5. Water Management Strategy Evaluation Framework Update (Mark Cowin, CALFED Water Management Strategy Program Manager/ Paul Brown, CALFED Consultant)

After lunch, Mr. Ritchie and Paul Brown (CALFED consultant) reviewed progress being made on the Water Management Strategy Evaluation Framework by explaining the assumptions driving the modeling effort and performance measures used to assess the three alternative water management strategies.

Discussion:

BDAC members discussed with Mark Cowin (CALFED staff) and Mr. Brown the following topics:

Purpose of evaluation -- The evaluation will be used to help determine the mix of water management strategy tools to pursue, and thus, refine the Water Management Strategy.

Performance measures -- It was clarified that the purpose of the performance measures is to measure progress towards meeting objectives, as well as to predict outcomes from use of the tools.

Assumptions -- It was suggested that CALFED be explicit about the level of confidence in the assumptions being used in the modeling and the limitations of employment data and models used to predict effects of the alternative strategies. Staff was asked to document which water quality standards are/are not included in the assumptions. It is assumed the South Delta Stage 1 actions will be a part of each of the three strategies being modeled.

Modeling outcomes -- In interpreting the results of the modeling, distinguish between area of origin, Delta and export drinking water quality. Quantify the environmental benefits so that a balanced cost/benefit analysis can be done. Quantification should include more than costs to users, somehow, improvements in the environment should be quantified, as well. Impacts on employment should be assessed sector by sector and should consider the quality of jobs lost, in addition to quantity.

Next steps -- The evaluation and modeling can be an adaptive management tool, so that as monitoring data is generated, the performance measure and modeling outcomes can be refined. For elements with few predictive performance measures, the program will rely on data collection and monitoring for results.

Staff Commitment:

Mr. Cowin stated he would try to document which water quality standards are and are not included in the assumptions.

6. Water Use Efficiency Progress Report (Tom Gohring, Mary Ann Dickenson, Roger Reynolds, Richard Roos-Collins)

Tom Gohring (CALFED staff) updated BDAC on the Water Use Efficiency program. Mary Ann Dickenson (California Urban Water Conservation Council [CUWCC]) responded to questions raised at the October 28, 1999 BDAC meeting by explaining potential shortfalls in cost projections for CALFED sponsored water use efficiency actions and how the Urban Council can help CALFED leverage its funds and increase water conservation. Roger Reynolds and Richard Roos-Collins (Agricultural Water Management Council) explained that the purpose of the Agricultural Council is to help water districts implement efficient water management practices and make a significant difference in how agricultural water will be managed.

Discussion:

BDAC members and the panel discussed the following issues:

Use of conserved water — BDAC members discussed whether water saved by more efficient practices will be used to offset unmet human demand or will be used to improve streamflow and water quality. Factors include storage capacity and how storage will save water from wet years for use in drier, subsequent years.

Governance — Success of the Councils will determine whether the partnership between the stakeholders and state and federal governments will be long term. Some decisions to be made include whether CALFED should pay for costs of overseeing CUWCC certification of water management plans and the appropriate level of conservation to be paid for by public investment. Factors include the amount of water conserved through locally cost-effective measures, costs of conservation and water recycling and storage.

Purpose of CALFED funding — It is anticipated that CALFED funding for agricultural conservation will pay for actions that go beyond the Efficient Water Management Practices, such as on-farm technical assistance, independent review of water management plans, preparation and implementation of plans.

Agricultural water measurement — This is still an issue that will be addressed by an independent panel and stakeholders working together to determine the appropriate methods of measuring water use and conservation.

**7. Ecosystem Restoration FY 2001 Draft Implementation Plan
Recommendation (Wendy Halverson Martin)**

Wendy Halverson Martin (CALFED staff) and Mr. Ritchie reviewed progress in developing the plan and explained the recommendation to approve the plan and the priorities to be included in the FY 2000 ecosystem restoration proposal solicitation. Ms. Martin reviewed with Mr. Buck and BDAC member Judith Redmond the recently approved process for review of previously funded projects. She also discussed with Mr. Schaver the option for tribes and other applicants to partner with universities and other institutions to ensure scientifically sound proposals.

Staff Commitment:

Mr. Ritchie committed to working with Mr. Brandt and Mr. Schaver to conduct effective outreach to tribes.

BDAC Action:

BDAC concurred with the joint recommendation from CALFED staff, Ecosystem Roundtable and the Interim Science Board.

8. Public Comment

Charles Melarkey (citizen) stated that the ecosystem restoration proposal solicitation process is skewed to benefit those who are most familiar with CALFED and academic research approaches. He also suggested that Interim Science Board members be subject to conflict of interest rules.

Chair Madigan adjourned the meeting at 4:00 pm.